

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview

1. **Date of Submission:** 2011-02-22

2. **Agency:** 007

3. **Bureau:** 21

4. **Name of this Investment:** Integrated Personnel and Pay System - Army

5. **Unique Project (Investment) Identifier (UPI):** 007-21-01-03-01-0599-00

6. **What kind of investment will this be in FY 2012?:** Planning

- Planning
- Full Acquisition
- Operations and Maintenance
- Mixed Life Cycle
- Multi-Agency Collaboration

7. **What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?** FY2012

8.

- a. **Provide a brief summary of the investment and justification, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap, specific accomplishments expected by the budget year and the related benefit to the mission, and the primary beneficiary(ies) of the investment.**

The Integrated Personnel and Pay System - Army (IPPS-A) provides the Army with an integrated, multi-component, personnel and pay system which streamlines Army Human Resources (HR), enhances the efficiency and accuracy of Army personnel and pay procedures, and supports soldiers and their families. IPPS-A will subsume approximately 70 Army legacy systems across the Army, Army Reserve, and National Guard, into one integrated system. IPPS-A will be a web-based tool, available 24 hours a day, accessible to the primary beneficiaries of Warfighter, HR professionals, combatant commanders, personnel and pay managers, and other authorized users throughout the Army. IPPS-A addresses major deficiencies in the delivery of military personnel and pay services and also provides internal controls and audit procedures that prevent erroneous payments and loss of funds. Army intends to design, develop, and implement IPPS-A using the enterprise Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System (DIMHRS) IT Investment initially developed by the Business Transformation Agency (BTA) and transitioned to the Services beginning in October 2009. The Army will build out the Army-specific attributes and functionality of the DIMHRS personnel and pay system to develop an integrated, Army-specific system. As part of this strategy, IPPS-A will be built using commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) software, upgrading the DIMHRS IT Investment platform to the latest version of PeopleSoft (v9.1), and migrating the DIMHRS environment to an Army Data Center. In FY12, IPPS-A will complete system Design, Development, and Integration efforts as well as System Development Testing for Release 1. In Q3 FY12, the Program will begin Government Acceptance Testing. In addition, IPPS-A will engage in multiple other activities related to system development and deployment, including the build-out of the Production environment and data centers; training of test participants; deployment planning; data conversion; interface conversion; security planning; reports and queries; and development of all program Milestone C documentation. IPPS-A is expected to attain a Full Deployment Decision (FDD) and begin deployment of Release 1 to the Army Active, Guard, and Reserve components in Q4 FY13, with full deployment across components to support approximately 1.2 million users in Q1 FY15. .

- b. **Provide any links to relevant websites that would be useful to gain additional information on the**

investment including links to GAO and IG reports.

Title	Link
NONE	

9.

- a. Provide the date of the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approval of this investment.
2009-09-08
- b. Provide the date of the most recent or planned approved project charter. 2009-09-08

10. Contact information?

- a. Program/Project Manager Name: *
Phone Number: *
Email: *
- b. Business Function Owner Name (i.e. Executive Agent or Investment Owner): LTG Thomas P. Bostick
Phone Number: *
Email: *

11. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (choose only one per FAC-P/PM or DAWIA): Project manager has been validated according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria as qualified for this investment.

- Project manager has been validated according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria as qualified for this investment.
- Project manager qualifications according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria is under review for this investment.
- Project manager assigned to investment, but does not meet requirements according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria.
- Project manager assigned but qualification status review has not yet started.
- No project manager has yet been assigned to this investment.

Section B: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.B.1: Summary of Funding

(In millions of dollars)

(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2010	CY 2011 (CY Continuing Resolution)	BY 2012	BY+1 2013	BY+2 2014	BY+3 2015	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Acquisition:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Planning & Acquisition Government FTE Costs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition(DME):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Operations & Maintenance:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Disposition Costs (optional):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Operations, Maintenance, Disposition Government FTE Costs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Subtotal O&M and Disposition Costs (SS):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL FTE Costs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL (not including FTE costs):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL (including FTE costs):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Number of FTE represented by	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Table I.B.1: Summary of Funding
(In millions of dollars)

(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2010	CY 2011 (CY Continuing Resolution)	BY 2012	BY+1 2013	BY+2 2014	BY+3 2015	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Costs:									

2. Insert the number of years covered in the column “PY-1 and earlier”: 1

3. Insert the number of years covered in the column “BY+4 and beyond”: *

4. If the summary of funding has changed from the FY 2011 President’s Budget request, briefly explain those changes:

*

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.C.1 Contracts Table

Contract Status	Contracting Agency ID	Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID)	Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) Reference ID	Solicitation ID	Alternative financing	EVM Required	Ultimate Contract Value (M)	Type of Contract/Task Order (Pricing)	Is the contract a Performance Based Service Acquisition (PBSA)?	Effective date	Actual or expected End Date of Contract/Task Order	Extent Completed	Short description of acquisition
Awarded		W91QUZ06A0003			*	*	\$283,205.1	Firm Fixed Price	N	2005-10-01		Y	Migrated Data Value Unknown
Awarded		W91QUZ06A0003			*	*	\$67,645.6	Firm Fixed Price	N	2005-10-01		Y	Migrated Data Value Unknown
Awarded		W91QUZ10P0011		W91QUZ10T0007	*	*	\$33,938.2	Firm Fixed Price	X	2010-04-20	2011-03-31	Y	License
Awarded		W91QUZ08D0009		W91QUZ07R0007	*	*	\$57,846,731.3	Order Dependent (IDV only)	N	2008-03-20		Y	Program Management Support Services
Awarded		W91QUZ09D0040		W91QUZ09R0001	*	*	\$8,870,000.0	Time and Materials	N	2009-06-03		Y	Basic Contract, PEO EIS ERP IV&V
Awarded		N0002401C6110			*	*	\$6,900,000.0	Firm Fixed Price	Y	2001-03-20	2016-12-20	Y	200111!012000!1700!D0231 !SPACE AND NAVAL WARFARE

Table I.C.1 Contracts Table

Contract Status	Contracting Agency ID	Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID)	Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) Reference ID	Solicitation ID	Alternative financing	EVM Required	Ultimate Contract Value (M)	Type of Contract/Task Order (Pricing)	Is the contract a Performance Based Service Acquisition (PBSA)?	Effective date	Actual or expected End Date of Contract/Task Order	Extent Completed	Short description of acquisition
													SYSTEMS

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

*

3.

- a. Has an Acquisition Plan been developed? If yes, please answer the questions that follow *
- b. Does the Acquisition Plan reflect the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 *
- c. Was the Acquisition Plan approved in accordance with agency requirements *
- d. If "yes," enter the date of approval? *
- e. Is the acquisition plan consistent with your agency Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan? *
- f. Does the acquisition plan meet the requirements of EOs 13423 and 13514? *
- g. If an Acquisition Plan has not been developed, provide a brief explanation.

*

Part II: IT Capital Investments

Section A: General

1.
 - a. **Confirm that the IT Program/Project manager has the following competencies: configuration management, data management, information management, information resources strategy and planning, information systems/network security, IT architecture, IT performance assessment, infrastructure design, systems integration, systems life cycle, technology awareness, and capital planning and investment control.** yes
 - b. **If not, confirm that the PM has a development plan to achieve competencies either by direct experience or education.**
2. **Describe the progress of evaluating cloud computing alternatives for service delivery to support this investment.** Due to PII and security requirements, IPPS-A is evaluating private cloud based computing environment solutions. As IPPS-A approaches MS B, the evaluation of cloud computing technology and availability at hosting sites will also be considered.
3. **Provide the date of the most recent or planned Quality Assurance Plan** 2010-08-02
4.
 - a. **Provide the UPI of all other investments that have a significant dependency on the successful implementation of this investment.**
 - b. **If this investment is significantly dependent on the successful implementation of another investment(s), please provide the UPI(s).**
5. **An Alternatives Analysis must be conducted for all Major Investments with Planning and Acquisition (DME) activities and evaluate the costs and benefits of at least three alternatives and the status quo. The details of the analysis must be available to OMB upon request. Provide the date of the most recent or planned alternatives analysis for this investment.** 2011-04-27
6. **Risks must be actively managed throughout the lifecycle of the investment. The Risk Management Plan and risk register must be available to OMB upon request. Provide the date that the risk register was last updated.** 2010-12-01

Section B: Cost and Schedule Performance

Table II.B.1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline:

Description of Activity	DME or SS	Agency EA Transition Plan Milestone Identifier	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
Requirements Definition	DME	*	\$38.6	\$36.6	2009-12-21	2009-12-21	2010-10-15		90.00%	95.00%
Requirements Analysis and Design	DME	*	\$123.9	\$32.9	2010-04-01	2010-04-01	2011-07-15		25.00%	20.00%
Release I - Development, Integration, Test, Evaluation, and Deployment; Release I will provide personnel and pay functionality required to process accurate calculation of pay.	DME	*	\$348.6	\$0.0	2011-02-01		2014-06-30		0.00%	0.00%
Release II - Development, Integration, Test, Evaluation, and Deployment; Release II will provide additional functionality required to support existing Army systems used for Boards and Evaluations.	DME	*	*	*	2013-04-01	*	2014-09-30	*	*	*
Release III - Development, Integration, Test, Evaluation, and Deployment; Release III will	DME	*	*	*	2013-10-01	*	2014-12-31	*	*	*

Table II.B.1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline:

Description of Activity	DME or SS	Agency EA Transition Plan Milestone Identifier	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
provide additional functionality required to support existing Army systems used for Retention Management.										
Operations and Support	SS	*	*	*	2013-09-01	*	2016-09-30	*	*	*

2. If the investment cost, schedule, or performance variances are not within 10 percent of the current baseline, provide a complete analysis of the reasons for the variances, the corrective actions to be taken, and the most likely estimate at completion. Not Applicable.

3. For mixed lifecycle or operations and maintenance investments an Operational Analysis must be performed annually. Operational analysis may identify the need to redesign or modify an asset by identifying previously undetected faults in design, construction, or installation/integration, highlighting whether actual operation and maintenance costs vary significantly from budgeted costs, or documenting that the asset is failing to meet program requirements. The details of the analysis must be available to OMB upon request. Insert the date of the most recent or planned operational analysis.

4. Did the Operational analysis cover all 4 areas of analysis: Customer Results, Strategic and Business Results, Financial Performance, and Innovation?

Section C: Financial Management Systems

Table II.C.1: Financial Management Systems			
System(s) Name	System acronym	Type of Financial System	BY Funding
*	*	*	*

Section D: Multi-Agency Collaboration Oversight (For Multi-Agency Collaborations only)

Table II.D.1. Customer Table:	
Customer Agency	Joint exhibit approval date
NONE	

Table II.D.2. Shared Service Providers		
Shared Service Provider (Agency)	Shared Service Asset Title	Shared Service Provider Exhibit 53 UPI (BY 2011)
*	*	*

Table II.D.3. For IT Investments, Partner Funding Strategies (\$millions):							
Partner Agency	Partner exhibit 53 UPI (BY 2012)	CY Monetary Contribution	CY “In-Kind” Contribution	CY Fee-for-Service	BY Monetary Contribution	BY “In-Kind” Contribution	BY Fee-for-Service
NONE							

Table II.D.4. Legacy Systems Being Replaced		
Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	Current UPI	Date of the System Retirement
*	*	*

Section E: Performance Information

Table I.E.1a. Performance Metric Attributes

Measurement Area (For IT Assets)	Measurement Grouping (For IT Assets)	Measurement Indicator	Reporting Frequency	Unit of Measure	Performance Measure Direction	Baseline	Year Baseline Established for this measure (Origination Date)
Technology	Data Reliability and Quality	Data Validity Assessment	monthly	Percent	Increase	99.7%	2010-07-23
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2010	99.9%	99.92%	Met	2010-09-20
Technology	Data Reliability and Quality	Data Validity Assessment	monthly	Percent	Increase	99.7%	2010-07-23
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2011	99.9%	99.94%	Met	2011-02-11
Technology	Data Reliability and Quality	Data Validity Assessment	monthly	Percent	Increase	99.7%	2010-07-23
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2012	99.9%	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
Technology	Data Reliability and Quality	Data Validity Assessment	monthly	Percent	Increase	99.7%	2010-07-23
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2013	99.9%	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Percent of customer	annual	Percent	Maintain Current Level	100%	2010-07-01

concurrence with
technical reviews exit
criteria (requirements,
design, technical, and
test).

Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
2010	100%	100%	Met	2010-09-20

Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Percent of customer concurrence with technical reviews exit criteria (requirements, design, technical, and test).	annual	Percent	Maintain Current Level	100%	2010-07-01
------------------	-----------------------	--	--------	---------	------------------------	------	------------

Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
2011	100%	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20

Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Percent of customer concurrence with technical reviews exit criteria (requirements, design, technical, and test).	annual	Percent	Maintain Current Level	100%	2010-07-01
------------------	-----------------------	--	--------	---------	------------------------	------	------------

Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
2012	100%	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20

Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Percent of customer concurrence with Technical Reviews exit criteria (requirements, design, technical, and test).	annual	Percent	Maintain Current Level	100%	2010-07-01
------------------	-----------------------	--	--------	---------	------------------------	------	------------

Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
-------------	--------	----------------	------------------------------	--------------

			2013	100%	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
Processes and Activities	Innovation and Improvement	Percent of identified program processes that are documented and approved.	monthly	Percent	Increase	85%	2010-07-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2010	85%	86%	Met	2010-09-20
Processes and Activities	Innovation and Improvement	Percent of identified program processes that are documented and approved.	monthly	Percent	Increase	85%	2010-07-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2011	88%	98%	Met	2011-04-26
Processes and Activities	Innovation and Improvement	Percent of identified program processes that are documented and approved.	monthly	Percent	Increase	85%	2010-07-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2012	91%	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
Processes and Activities	Innovation and Improvement	Percent of identified program processes that are documented and approved.	monthly	Percent	Increase	85%	2010-07-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2013	94%	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20

Mission and Business Results	Contingency Planning	The percent of program risks (measured by exposure) closed successfully compared to total closed.	quarterly	Percent	Increase	0%	2010-08-17
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2010	50%	At the time this indicator was developed, there were not enough data points to produce a result. Program tracking will begin in FY11.	Not Due	2011-02-11
Mission and Business Results	Contingency Planning	The percent of program risks (measured by exposure) closed successfully compared to total closed.	quarterly	Percent	Increase	0%	2010-08-17
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2011	60%	100%	Met	2011-04-26
Mission and Business Results	Contingency Planning	The percent of program risks (measured by exposure) closed successfully compared to total closed.	quarterly	Percent	Increase	0%	2010-08-17
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2012	70%	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20
Mission and Business Results	Contingency Planning	The percent of program risks (measured by exposure) closed successfully compared to total closed.	quarterly	Percent	Increase	0%	2010-08-17
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated

2013	80%	TBD	Not Due	2010-09-20

* - Indicates data is redacted.